No. 4. "provide you 800 bolls meal, you paying L. the price at the rate "of L.;" the factor so selling, is no further bound to the buyer, than to produce and furnish him with a sufficient commission from his employer to sell the goods, but is not himself liable for the performance.

1738, June 16,

PRINGLE and Porteous against Mr DAVID KENNEDY.

No. 5.

THE Lords found, that a writer about the Court having accepted a factory from a foreigner to pursue a process here, though nothing blameable upon the said factor's part appeared in the management of the process; yet by becoming pursuer for a foreigner, he had subjected himself to such expenses as might be modified in case the process at his employer's instance should be found to be vexatious; seeing otherwise any decreet for expenses against his employer must probably have had no effect.

1739. July 19. ROBERTSON against POTTER, and HORN His Factor.

No. 6.

THE Lords repeated the same judgment as in the above case.

1739. November 30.

CRAWFURD against REPRESENTATIVES of CRAWFURD.

No. 7.

A FACTOR transacting and taking bond in his own name, his representatives have the *jus exigendi*, but for behoof of their constituents, and any defence good against the constituents will be good against them.

1749. November 16.

MINE ADVENTURING COMPANY against Andrew Brown.

No. 8.

An overseer of mines, which his employer had made over to a purchaser who had got possession of the mines, and pursued a summary removing against the overseer, to remove from a farm belonging to the mines, on which furnaces and other expensive works had been erected; the Court, on